

**Chat Log C:\Users\ghenrikson\Documents\ChatLog STR Ordinance Revisions \_ Town Hall \_1 2021\_09\_24 11\_32.rtf**

**Scott Harn (to Everyone):** 10:04 AM: Does the format of this session include responses to questions from Commissioners or County Staff to questions from the public, or do we just make comments with no reply?

**Jeff Davis (to Everyone):** 10:11 AM: It's showing.

**Dr. Clare Hasler-Lewis (to Everyone):** 10:59 AM: Perhaps this question is not appropriate for this particular Town Hall meeting but I will pose it and would like an answer at some point from the Commissioners. We live in Surf Pines, a gated, planned community in Clatsop County (CC). Our Association was formed pursuant to and incorporated in 1969 under the Oregon Nonprofit Corporation Act. We have our own CCRs/Bylaws. The question is this: Can the Surf Pines HOA establish it's OWN RULES on STRs, i.e., cap them or phase them out altogether (pursuant to a vote by the appropriate percent of owners per the CCRs) REGARDLESS of what CC decides to do. In other words, will CC rules/regs supersede what SP owners decide to do? Yes or no?

**Kathy Grewe (to Everyone):** 11:06 AM: I completely agree that the owner needs to be responsible. The renters may change too frequently to police each one. / KG

**Kathy Grewe (to Everyone):** 11:09 AM: I don't need to comment publicly but my vote is to not allow transferability.

**Carolyn Crawford (to Everyone):** 11:11 AM: Conversely this "takes" from resale value. .

**Carolyn Crawford (to Everyone):** 11:12 AM: I agree that any new owner needs to be reinspected and in compliance

**Jeff Davis (to Everyone):** 11:15 AM: We support the prohibition against transferability.

**Elyse Shoop (to Everyone):** 11:17 AM: I agree that transferability should NOT be automatic. Being an STR owner is basically a "contract" between the owner and the County. Conversely, if one owner lost their license due to multiple infractions, should the next owner be automatically banned from ever getting a permit?